

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

)
)
In Re: Bair Hugger Forced Air) File No. 15-MD-2666
Warming Devices Products) (JNE/FLN)
Liability Litigation)
) December 20, 2018
) Minneapolis, Minnesota
) Courtroom 12W
) 9:44 a.m.
)
)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOAN N. ERICKSEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

And THE HONORABLE DAVID T. SCHULTZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

(STATUS CONFERENCE)

APPEARANCES

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

MESHBESHER & SPENCE
Genevieve M. Zimmerman
1616 Park Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55404

CIRESI CONLIN
Jan Conlin
Michael Sacchet
225 South 6th Street
Suite 4600
Minneapolis, MN

KENNEDY HODGES, LLP
Gabriel Assaad
David Hodges
4409 Montrose Blvd
Suite 200
Houston, TX 77006

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

KAster LYNCH FARRAR & BALL, LLP
Kyle Farrar
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, TX 77002

PRITZKER HAGEMAN, P.A.
David J. Szerlag
45 South 7th Street, #2950
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1652

GOLDENBERG LAW, PLLC
Noah Lauricella
800 LaSalle Avenue
Suite 2150
Minneapolis, MN 55402

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

LEVIN PAPANTONIO
Daniel Nigh
316 S. Baylen Street
Suite 600
Pensacola, FL 32502

MESHBESHER & SPENCE
Holly Sternquist
1616 Park Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55404

PETERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
Brian Emerson Tadtman
801 W. 47th Street, Suite 107
Kansas City, MO 64112

THE OLINDE FIRM, LLC
Alfred Olinde
400 Poydras Street
Suite 1980
New Orleans, LA 70130

MORGAN & MORGAN, PA
Heather Cullen
Michael S. Goetz
Joseph T. Waechter
201 N. Franklin St 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

RAIZNER SLANIA, LLP
Jeffrey Raizner
Rica Rinos
Erin Stracerner
Kristen Gorombol
2402 Dunlavy Street
Houston, TX 77006

LONCAR & ASSOCIATES
William Hymes
John L. Coveney
424 S. Cesar Chavez Blvd
Dallas, TX 75201

CAPRETZ & ASSOCIATES
Don K. Ledgard
5000 Birch St, Suite 2500
Newport Beach, ca 92660

MICHAEL HINGLE & ASSOCIATES
Michael Hingle
Heidi Pellagrini
Colleen Euper
220 Gause Blvd
Slidell, LA 70005

HOUSSIERE DURANT & HOUSSIERE
Randall A. Kauffman
Monica Vaughan
Shirley Strom-Blanchard
1990 Post Oak Blvd Suite 800
Houston, TX 77056

DAVIS & CRUMP, PC
Martin D. Crump
Robert Cain, Jr.
2601 Fourteenth Street
Gulfport, MS 39507

THE RUTH TEAM
Austin Grinder
Steven Ruth
Eric Roslansky
842 Ramond Avenue
Suite 200
Saint Paul, MN 33733-5157

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

LAW OFFICE OF TRAVIS R. WALKER
Travis R. Walker
1235 SE Indian Street
Suite 101
Stuart, FL 34997

ANDREWS & THORNTON
Anne Andrews
John Thornton
Lauren Davis
2 Corporate Park, Suite 110
Irvine, CA 92606

LORD & ASSOCIATES
Priscilla Lord
Melissa Heinlein
309 Clifton Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403

MURRAY LAW FIRM
Caroline W. Thomas
650 Poydras Street
Suite 2150
New Orleans, LA 70130

BROWN & CROUPPEN, PC
Liz Liberatore
Seth S. Webb
Meghan Ellis
Abby Cordray
Vanessa Mixco
211 North Broadway, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102

BEASLEY ALLEN
Matthew Munson
218 Commerce Street
Montgomery, AL 36104

HOLLIS LEGAL SOLUTIONS, PLLC
Natasha Ingram Hollis
6814 Crumpler Boulevard,
Suite 101
Olive Branch, MS 38654

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

PARKER WAICHMAN, LLP
Michael S. Werner
Justyna Callanan
Nicole Eisner
Giselle Grant
59 Maiden Lane
6th Floor
New York, NY 10038

LANGDON & EMISON
Brett Emison
Rachel Ahmann
Tricia Campbell
Lauren Niendick
911 Main Street
Lexington, MO 64067

LEWIS & CAPLAN
Rebecca Robinson
3631 Canal Street
New Orleans, LA 70119

THE WEBSTER LAW FIRM
Chelsie Garza
6200 Savoy Suite 150
Houston, TX 77036

MARTIN HARDING & MAZZOTI, LLP
Rosemarie Bogdan
1222 Troy-Schenectady Road
P.O. Box 15141
Albany, NY 12212-5141

BACHUS & SCHANKER, LLC
Allison Brown
Darin Schanker
J. Kyle Bachus
Krysta Hand
Kyle Bachus
Alexandra Franklin
J. Christopher Elliott
Noelle Collins
1899 Wynkoop Street, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

DEGARIS LAW GROUP, LLC
Annesley DeGaris
Wayne Rogers, Jr.
3179 Green Valley Road 235
Birmingham, AL 35243

MORRIS LAW FIRM
Jim Morris
Shane Greenberg
Rochelle Burris
411 W. Alameda Avenue
Suite 611
Burbank, CA 91505

THE AHEARNE LAW FIRM, PLLC
Allan J. Ahearne
Jessica Pauley
Abigail Spurney
24 Main Street
Warwick, NY 10990

NEAL R. ELLIOTT, JR.
P.O. Box 80136
Baton Rouge, LA 70898

HARE WYNN NEWELL & NEWTON
Don McKenna
Peggy Little
Lynne Reed
Massey Building
2025 Third Avenue North
Suite 800
Birmingham, AL 35203

MCEWEN LAW FIRM, LTD
Emily Robinson
Gregory N. McEwen
5850 Blackshire Path
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD LLP
Morris Dweck
Michael Nunez
10 East 40th Street
New York, NY 10016

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

KIRTLAND AND PACKARD LLP
Behram V. Parekh
2041 Rosecreans Avenue
Third Floor, Suite 300
El Segundo, CA 90245

GROSSMAN & MOORE, PLLC
Emily A. DeVuono
Jennifer Moore
Ashton R. Smith
Elizabeth Coulter
Kara Lane
401 W. Main Street
Suite 1810
Louisville, KY 40202

CARR & CARR ATTORNEYS
Patrick E. Carr
4416 S. Harvard Avenue
Tulsa, OK 74135

CHARLES H. JOHNSON LAW
Charles H. Johnson
2599 Mississippi Street
New Brighton, MN 55112

RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK
& BRICKMAN, LLC
Dan Haltiwanger
Missi Cruz
P.O. Box 1368
Barnwell, SC 29812

COLLING GILBERG WRIGHT & CARTER
Lia Ann Thomas
The Florida Firm
801 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 830
Orlando, FL 32801

SHOWARD LAW FIRM PC
Diana Ezra Robles
4703 E Camp Lowell Drive
Suite 253
Tucson, AZ 85712

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL PATRICK
Michael W. Patrick
100 Timberhill Place, Suite 127
PO. Box 16848
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

BAILEY PEAUVY BAILEY COWAN
HECKAMAN, PLLC
Justin Jenson
Jennifer Martin
K Camp Bailey
Robert Cowan
The Lyric Centre
440 Louisiana Street
Suite 2100
Houston, TX 77002

MCSWEENEY LANGEVIN
Jonathan Mencil
2116 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55404

PRITZKER HAGEMAN, P.A.
Wendy Thayer
45 South 7th Street, #2950
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1652

SIDNEY P. COMINSKY, LLC
Sidney P. Cominsky
Anna Poyurovksy
1500 State Tower Building
Syracuse, NY 13202

HAUSFELD LLP
Angel Dorsey
Richard S. Lewis
1700 K St. NW, Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006

HURLEY MCKENNA & MERTZ
Michael Mertz
33 North Dearborn Street
Suite 1430
Chicago, IL 60602

(Appearances continued on next page:)

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS APPEARING BY PHONE:

BRENT COON & ASSOCIATES
Jim A. Morris, Jr.
Matthew R. Willis
Miyoshi Rivers
215 Orleans Street
Beaumont, TX 77701

GRAY & WHITE LAW
Cathy Jones
713 E. Market Street
Suite 200
Louisville, KY 40202

KERSHAW COOK & TALLEY, PC
William A. Kershaw
401 Watt Avenue, Suite 1
Sacramento, CA 95864

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

BLACKWELL BURKE P.A.
Jerry Blackwell
Ben Hulse
Mary Young
Ted Hartman
431 South Seventh Street
Suite 2500
Minneapolis, MN 55415

COURT REPORTER:

Maria V. Weinbeck, RMR, FCRR
U.S. Courthouse
300 South Fourth Street, #1005
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
transcript produced by computer.

* * * * *

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (9:44 a.m.)

3 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.

4 Welcome.

5 Would someone on the phone please say something so
6 we know that you can hear us?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Good, thanks. All right. Now they're
9 muted. I suggest that we start right in marching through
10 the joint agenda.

11 On the bellwethers, might there be some benefit in
12 adding some cases? I think we're getting down to kind of a
13 skimpy number again, so I suggest that you add at least a
14 couple more.

15 How about a review of the state cases? Anybody
16 want to do that?

17 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
18 Genevieve Zimmerman. There are, I think, two, well, so
19 Ramsey County cases are -- have been argued to the Court of
20 Appeals. I think we'll have a decision by statute sometime
21 before I think like the ninth of February.

22 And then the other two State Court cases, there's
23 one in Hidalgo County, Texas. That's the Petitta v.
24 Dr. Trey Fulp. They had an interlocutory appeal about
25 whether or not the orthopedic surgeon could continue to be

1 in the case. The hospital has actually settled out. The
2 orthopedic surgeon took the case up to the Court of Appeals,
3 tried to reverse the motion to dismiss, lost, and that case
4 is now I think they had a hearing yesterday and they are
5 beginning to proceed with discovery. So we've been in
6 contact with those attorneys.

7 And then there is this other case in Montana where
8 I don't believe there's much action happening at this point.

9 THE COURT: And nothing to report from Canada?

10 MS. ZIMMERMAN: We still haven't heard anything
11 new in Canada.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MS. ZIMMERMAN: With respect to the discovery on
14 the two bellwethers that remain.

15 THE COURT: Right.

16 MS. ZIMMERMAN: There are two cases, Partlow and
17 Trombley. Trombley, I believe we have a number of
18 depositions set in the first week of January, and there is a
19 motion pending before Your Honors with respect to a motion
20 for leave to amend, and this is the Ohio issue that has come
21 up on a couple of cases.

22 Partlow is another case, and I believe that that's
23 set for an argument later today on a motion for judgment on
24 the pleadings. We did have a couple of depositions and a
25 hospital inspection on Monday this week. Those went

1 forward, and the discovery deadlines are outlined in the
2 joint status report.

3 Fact discovery is set to close on January 11th.
4 Initial expert reports would be January 18th. Rebuttal
5 reports on February 8th, and then the parties are to inform
6 the Court as to which case should be tried in May by
7 February 15th. And I think that that is really --

8 THE COURT: Other than our Rule 23 and Rule 14
9 march through. Let's do that.

10 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Okay.

11 MR. HULSE: Your Honor, if we start with PTO-14,
12 I'd like to introduce our colleague Ted Hartman, who will be
13 taking over that argument today.

14 MR. HARTMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Ted
15 Hartman on behalf of defendants.

16 THE COURT: So you are.

17 MR. HARTMAN: So there was a letter submitted on
18 behalf of the defendant yesterday regarding the cases that
19 have been withdrawn from the motion. That's 19 cases and
20 then there was a case dismissed as well.

21 THE COURT: Hold on. Is that McClain?

22 MR. HARTMAN: McClain was dismissed. That's
23 correct.

24 THE COURT: Okay. And then the 19 that you're no
25 longer moving on are:

1 Bond, Henderson, Spry, Picuri, Reed, Gilmore,
2 Falcetta, Darwick, Wolf, Hauser, Farrell, Wolfe, Rodliff,
3 Turnage, Yost, Johnson, Carter, Cerbins and Mitchell.

4 MR. HARTMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. So that's 19 in that
6 category and then the 19 remaining, correct?

7 MR. HARTMAN: That's correct. And then the next
8 category is the cases which no response has been filed.
9 There are 13 cases there from Levin Papantonio we've been in
10 communications with their counsel, and we understand that
11 those are unopposed.

12 And then there is also one case, Robinson from
13 Travis Walker, and there was a late PFS filed late last
14 night which we have reviewed and remains deficient, and so
15 we are still seeking dismissal of that matter, and that
16 should be all 14 of the cases where no response was filed.

17 THE COURT: All right. So is that Barnes, Ussery,
18 Welch, Conrad, that list?

19 MR. HARTMAN: Yes, that is correct.

20 THE COURT: So Barnes, Ussery, Robinson. That's
21 the one who said "NA" to height and weight?

22 MR. HARTMAN: Yes, as well as not providing the
23 dates or addresses for the medical providers, and also we
24 don't have medical records either.

25 THE COURT: Okay, that has to qualify as a no

1 response, so Robinson is dismissed.

2 Welch, Conrad, Snow, Branch, Ramondo, Reid,
3 Roshell, Shade, Scott, Twichell and Custer are the ones you
4 are talking about?

5 MR. HARTMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Zimmerman, anything you want
7 to say about those cases?

8 MS. ZIMMERMAN: No, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. So they're dismissed.

10 MR. HARTMAN: Then, Your Honor, we have the five
11 cases remaining where there have been responses filed. I
12 have two of those cases where the response didn't contest
13 the motion on the merits. It just recited an inability to
14 communicate with the client.

15 THE COURT: And would that be Pimentel and Adams?

16 MR. HARTMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: So the Pimentel, he's the one who is
18 80, right?

19 MR. HARTMAN: That's my understanding from the
20 response.

21 THE COURT: We'll give you another 90 days. It,
22 looked like he's 80 years old, and the deficiencies were
23 things that should be easily cured, so I know there already
24 was a 90-day extension, but we'll give them another 90 days.

25 MR. HARTMAN: All right.

1 THE COURT: Adams is dismissed.

2 MR. HARTMAN: And then we have the last three
3 cases are all from the Bernstein Liebhard cases. These were
4 carried over from two months ago when Your Honor gave them
5 30 days to respond to defense's contention that they had
6 whited out dates on prior verifications, and that's the same
7 issue for all three of those cases. And in response, I
8 believe the -- well, there wasn't a response filed within
9 the 30 days after the motion was brought --

10 THE COURT: I'm sorry, there was or wasn't?

11 MR. HARTMAN: There was no response filed within
12 that 30 day period to the contention that these were
13 re-dated. In responding to the motion to dismiss,
14 plaintiffs said that they had a policy of not re-dating
15 verifications which is at least not a consistent policy
16 based on Your Honor's rulings last two months ago, and said
17 that they were unable to find evidence in the file that
18 would give them knowledge or information as to whether these
19 were whited out.

20 And we had previously after the October status
21 conference, defendants had submitted copies for the Court by
22 a letter of those verifications that we contend are whited
23 out and re-dated. But if Your Honor would like, we brought
24 copies as well today.

25 THE COURT: Let's just see, Ms. Zimmerman, did you

1 have any response on this one?

2 MS. ZIMMERMAN: I don't on these cases, Your
3 Honor, but I have received a message that there is someone
4 on the telephone that is wanting to address at least one of
5 the cases. I'm not sure which.

6 THE COURT: And they're unmuted, so whoever that
7 is should have the opportunity to speak up.

8 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. WALKER: Your Honor?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 MR. WALKER: Hi. Good morning, Your Honor. I
12 tried to interject previously. This is Travis Walker here
13 on behalf of a previously called case Robinson. I don't
14 know if we would like to address that now or if Your Honor
15 would prefer to finish what you're currently working on and
16 re-address Robinson, but I would like to be heard on
17 Robinson.

18 THE COURT: Robinson, if I'm remembering, I don't
19 have it in front of me. Robinson is the one who said "NA"
20 on the height and weight and everything?

21 MR. WALKER: Yes, Your Honor. And we just filed a
22 new PFS last night as well as before this hearing this
23 morning with correcting the deficiencies, Your Honor. So
24 we're respectfully requesting a review of that the newly,
25 both the one filed last night as well as this morning.

1 THE COURT: Did you file two? One last night and
2 one this morning? Or is it just the one?

3 MR. WALKER: We filed two because the first one
4 that was filed last night did not include dates with it.
5 And we realized that this morning and then we completed it
6 accurately this morning.

7 THE COURT: All right. I'll not dismiss that.
8 We'll give the defendants another status conference to take
9 a look at what you just submitted.

10 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Thanks -- was it Walker? Thanks, Mr.
12 Walker.

13 MR. WALKER: Yes, Your Honor.

14 MR. DWECK: Your Honor?

15 THE COURT: Yes?

16 MR. DWECK: Attorney for plaintiffs Billings,
17 Edwards and --

18 THE COURT: Johnston.

19 MR. DWECK: I'm not sure if you wanted me to
20 interdict at this moment, Your Honor, or if there was more
21 to be said in the courtroom?

22 THE COURT: Just a second. We really can't hear
23 anything you said. So would you start again with your name?

24 MR. DWECK: Sure, Your Honor. My name is Morris,
25 M-O-R-R-I-S, last name is Dweck, D as in David, W-E-C-K.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And you represent?

2 MR. DWECK: Plaintiffs Billings, Edwards and
3 Johnston.

4 THE COURT: Okay. And were you on the line last
5 time when we discussed these cases?

6 MR. DWECK: I was not, Your Honor. I believe
7 Mr. Lee was on the line. He's no longer with the firm, but
8 I mean he did brief me on the issue before he left. It was
9 my understanding from the conversation with Mr. Lee that,
10 you know, that we should respond to defendants and speak to
11 them about the issue, not that I guess a formal response in
12 the form of a motion should be filed, but we did file a
13 response in response to the defense motion to dismiss.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Hartman?

15 MR. HARTMAN: Well, Your Honor, there was a
16 written order issued that clearly stated that there was a
17 response to be filed within 30 days if they contended that
18 these were not reused copies. And during the hearing, the
19 Court also made clear in October that that was the
20 expectation.

21 And in fact in response to Ms. Zimmerman's
22 suggestion that they could just file new verifications to
23 resolve this, the Court did reject that at the time. The
24 only reason these cases weren't addressed at that hearing is
25 because the Court didn't have an opportunity to review the

1 verification.

2 So the question about whether or not to cure that,
3 that ship had sailed in October, and the real question here
4 is just whether these were copies. There's been no
5 substantive response to that contention.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Dweck, anything?

7 MR. DWECK: Yes, Your Honor. So Mr. Lee was in
8 charge of the cases at the time. So, unfortunately, I don't
9 have, you know, intimate knowledge. But I did take a look
10 at the letters submitted by defense with all the copies and,
11 you know, while if I look at each one individually, you
12 know, I cannot tell that it's whited out. And the 397, the
13 three dates on them do appear different. It doesn't look
14 like one person filled in the dates.

15 You know, I can't say that -- I don't have any,
16 you know, knowledge whether or not someone in the office or
17 plaintiffs did do something to the verifications, but I do
18 know that these three cases multiple verifications were
19 submitted, you know, to cure the PFSSs. And I mean we didn't
20 submit new verifications in order to, you know, try to just
21 say that this issue doesn't matter, but just out of an
22 abundance of caution we thought it would be, you know, wise
23 to submit a new verification to Your Honor showing that the
24 clients were still involved in the case and were still
25 updating their PFSSs to cure whatever deficiencies they

1 could.

2 THE COURT: So there were fresh verifications
3 done?

4 MR. HARTMAN: You could check with him, but I
5 believe he's referring to the whited out verifications as
6 being submitted.

7 MR. DWECK: No, that's incorrect. I'm stating
8 that within the past 30 days there were new verifications
9 submitted on all three of these cases.

10 MR. HARTMAN: So in the last week or two weeks for
11 one of the cases, Your Honor, they obtained new
12 verifications from their client and said that they cured
13 these instead of responding directly to the allegation that
14 they were whited out. Defendant's position consistent with
15 the Court's prior ruling and statements in Court was that
16 that was not sufficient, that these were supposed to be
17 cured in October, and that the only question was whether
18 they were cured at that time.

19 THE COURT: Well, the problem is that that whiting
20 out might have been done by the lawyers not with the firm
21 anymore. And now if there are actual verifications, I don't
22 want the plaintiffs to suffer as a result of whatever that
23 lawyer might have done. I doubt very much that the clients
24 did the whiting out.

25 MR. HARTMAN: And I think that's the probably the

1 case, Your Honor, if we had to guess why that occurred.

2 THE COURT: Right.

3 MR. HARTMAN: The concern that the defense has is
4 because they've made this misrepresentation or been
5 nontransparent with the Court about this, they've been put
6 in a better position than other attorneys and plaintiffs who
7 came to the Court candidly and acknowledged that they hadn't
8 complied, and their cases were dismissed because they didn't
9 comply with the order and, you know, this has been --

10 THE COURT: Right, okay, but I'm going to hold off
11 because of the lawyer problem. It was one thing when we had
12 the lawyer who -- it was one thing when we had that lawyer,
13 but now we have a fresh lawyer, and we're going to give this
14 fellow, Mr. Dweck, a chance.

15 MR. HARTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So take a look at what was
17 submitted and take whatever action is required.

18 MR. HARTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And I think
19 that's it for PFSS then.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Dweck, anything else?

21 MR. DWECK: No, that's all, Your Honor. Thank you
22 very much.

23 THE COURT: Yep. Okay, I'm putting the mute back
24 on now.

25 MR. HULSE: PTO23, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: I looked down and then when I looked
2 up again, Mr. Hartman was gone, and Mr. Hulse had
3 miraculously taken his place.

4 MR. HULSE: Quick change.

5 THE COURT: All right. I'm ready.

6 MR. HULSE: This is our fourth PTO23 motion, Your
7 Honor. It covers nine cases. One of those cases Ducote,
8 16CV3940, was dismissed by stipulation. That leaves eight.
9 No opposition was filed as to six of the remaining cases,
10 which I can list if Your Honor would like.

11 THE COURT: So that would be Cole?

12 MR. HULSE: Correct.

13 THE COURT: Dismiss Ashby.

14 MR. HULSE: Correct.

15 THE COURT: Dismiss Jennings.

16 MR. HULSE: Correct.

17 THE COURT: Dismissed. Spear?

18 MR. HULSE: Yes, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Dismissed. Trewhella dismissed?

20 MR. HULSE: Yes, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: And Ward?

22 MR. HULSE: That covers it.

23 THE COURT: Dismissed, okay. Now Chapman?

24 MR. HULSE: Yes, Chapman there's an opposition.

25 As we mentioned in our brief, we've been, due to doubts on

1 our part about some firm's compliance with PTO23, we've been
2 conducting our own review of obituaries for the plaintiffs,
3 and this is a case where we found an obituary for the
4 plaintiff, notified plaintiffs' counsel. Plaintiffs'
5 counsel opposes on the basis that the obituary that we sent
6 is, they say they've been unable to confirm that the client
7 is dead with the client's next of kin.

8 In our reply, we cited yet another obituary that
9 matches on full name, including middle name, date of birth,
10 residence. Daughter's got a rather unusual name too. All
11 of this matches the PFS and still no suggestion of death has
12 been filed. So this case, from our point of view, is
13 clearly far out of compliance with PTO23 and should be
14 dismissed with prejudice.

15 THE COURT: Ms. Zimmerman?

16 MR. HODGES: Your Honor, if I may be heard.

17 David Hodges here on behalf of Kenneth Chapman.
18 Your Honor, the only evidence in the record at this point is
19 unauthentic hearsay that the defendant has submitted. It's
20 true we have not gotten confirmation. This particular
21 individual has a twin. It has a somewhat similar first
22 name. I'm not saying that the twin is dead, but we don't
23 know for sure. And so in our exercise of due diligence, we
24 have not filed the suggestion of death because we don't have
25 confirmation with the family.

1 There's been no death certificate that's been
2 filed by the defendants. It's nothing but in their reply
3 they --

4 THE COURT: All right. Within 30 days get
5 something from your client saying he's alive or else it will
6 be dismissed.

7 MR. HODGES: Okay.

8 MR. HULSE: Your Honor, I would say one more word
9 on that case, but I'll move on if --

10 THE COURT: No, he's got 30 days to prove he's
11 alive.

12 MR. HULSE: All right, Your Honor. Thank you.

13 THE COURT: What about Ciccone?

14 MR. HULSE: I'm assuming that it's Ciccone, like
15 Madonna, Your Honor, so. The one that plaintiffs --

16 THE COURT: Is that her last name? Madonna, is
17 that her last name?

18 MR. HULSE: Madonna Veronica Louise Ciccone.

19 THE COURT: If you say so.

20 MR. HULSE: And so, Your Honor, this is a case
21 suggestion of death was filed July 2nd. The motion to
22 substitute was due September 30th. The Court granted an
23 extension. Judge Schultz granted an extension until
24 October 31st to file a motion to substitute. No motion to
25 substitute has been filed, and plaintiffs' counsel indicates

1 that efforts to contact the next of kin have been
2 unsuccessful. This case is just like the Lister case, which
3 the Court dismissed with prejudice in its October 26th
4 order.

5 THE COURT: Anybody want to say anything on the
6 Cicccone case?

7 MR. HODGES: Your Honor, I'll just rest on my
8 papers.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Cicccone is dismissed.

10 MR. HULSE: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anything else
12 before we move to the Partlow motions?

13 MR. BLACKWELL: Good morning.

14 THE COURT: Good morning.

15 MR. BLACKWELL: There is an Axline motion also.

16 THE COURT: Right, Partlow and Axline. Do you
17 want to do our Axline first?

18 MR. BLACKWELL: Certainly, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Sure.

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, we're happy to rest on
21 the papers on Axline as well.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Axline is going to be dismissed
23 with prejudice. I do want to get to Partlow. Mr. Hulse?

24 MR. HULSE: Good morning, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Good morning.

1 MR. HULSE: May I proceed?

2 THE COURT: Please.

3 MR. HULSE: So, Your Honor, the big issues in this
4 12C motion are statute of limitations, which applies to the
5 products liability counts and then the Minnesota Consumer
6 Protection claims.

7 So there's no dispute here that the products
8 liability and unjust enrichment claims in this Complaint are
9 subject to a two-year statute of limitations and that the
10 warranty claim under Alabama law is subject to a four year
11 statute of limitations. There's also no dispute that
12 there's no discovery rule in Alabama. So the only exception
13 that conceivably could then apply is fraudulent concealment
14 to toll the statute of limitations.

15 There was a series of decisions from the Alabama
16 Supreme Court in the early 1980's that have very, very
17 narrowly defined what constitutes fraudulent concealment,
18 And the interesting thing is they are pleading cases. They
19 are cases where dismissal was based on the pleadings. And
20 those cases are *Cazalas v. Johns-Manville*, 435 So. 2d.

21 THE COURT: Just a second. I just want to make
22 sure that's the case I read. I think that's a familiar
23 sounding --

24 MR. HULSE: This is the big case.

25 THE COURT: Yes, I'm sure it is. Is that the one

1 where they said that it wasn't concealment of the right to
2 bring a lawsuit?

3 MR. HULSE: Right. Exactly, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. HULSE: Yep. So it's basically the rule that
6 comes out of *Cazalas*, and then the other case is *Miller v.*
7 *Mobile County Board of Health*, which is actually a medical
8 device case, it's a Dalkon Shield case, is that the
9 plaintiffs do establish fraudulent concealment have to plead
10 and then prove "that the defendants concealed the cause of
11 action or injury and what prevented the plaintiff from
12 discovering the facts surrounding the injury."

13 What they have to show is that the defendant
14 affirmatively prevented the discovery of facts or
15 affirmatively prevented the discovery of the injury.

16 If I could just sort of talk about *Cazalas* for a
17 moment. So in that case you've got the plaintiffs were a
18 group of shipyard workers, and they've alleged that the
19 manufacturers of asbestos products fraudulently concealed
20 their product liability causes of action because the
21 manufacturers knew about the risks of asbestos but failed to
22 put warnings on the packages, failed to disseminate the
23 warnings, and interestingly also breached a duty to tell the
24 local unions about the dangers of asbestos. The idea of the
25 local unions would then have disseminated it to the workers.

1 And what the Supreme Court of Alabama said there
2 is those allegations could support a failure to warn theory,
3 but there is simply not fraudulent concealment. What these
4 allegations don't give rise to is a conclusion that the
5 manufacturers of asbestos actually affirmatively prevented
6 the workers from discovering the dangers of asbestos or
7 somehow duped them into not bringing claims. So, you know,
8 and I'd say that that's about as tight a restriction as
9 you'll find in case law anywhere on fraudulent concealment.

10 The twin case to that that came out right around
11 the same time is the *Miller v. Mobile County Board of Health*
12 case, 409 So.2d, page 420. In that case the plaintiff
13 alleged both that her clinic and that the manufacturer of
14 Dalkon Shield had failed to warn her of the risks resulting
15 in a miscarriage. And that claim was dismissed as time
16 barred and then affirmed by the Supreme Court of Alabama.

17 And in particular, the Supreme Court of Alabama
18 said that the Complaint had failed to allege what prevented
19 Mrs. Miller, that's the plaintiff, from discovering the
20 facts surrounding the injury. Notably about that case is
21 there's no discussion of there being a special relationship
22 between a medical device manufacturer and a patient, a
23 person who uses the device.

24 One of the things that plaintiffs has contended is
25 that there's a fact issue as to whether there's a sort of a

1 fiduciary relationship between 3M, Arizant and Ms. Partlow.
2 And that's contrary to the *Miller* case. It also finds no
3 support in Alabama law.

4 The one case they cite to support that special
5 relationship is a case that's based on an Alabama statute
6 that creates a fiduciary-type relationship between a
7 pharmacist and a client. And they don't cite, and there
8 isn't any kind of statute like that for medical device
9 manufacturers.

10 So really our view here is that the allegations
11 that are in the Master Complaint, which is what the
12 plaintiff is relying on here can support, subject to other
13 arguments we may have, a failure-to-warn type theory, but
14 they simply do not meet the Alabama standard for fraudulent
15 concealment.

16 Another thing that plaintiffs have contends is
17 they say, well, this is an MDL. We have short form
18 Complaints. We used a short form Complaint here. But case
19 law including some very recent case law that we've cited in
20 our reply brief makes very clear that just because you're in
21 an MDL doesn't mean that the requirements of Rule 8 or
22 Rule 9B drop away. That if you need to for your claim to go
23 forward, you need to plead fraudulent concealment with
24 specificity. You can't simply say, well, that's not part of
25 the template. There are extra lines that are left on the

1 short form Complaint. You can attach a page, but if you're
2 going to plead fraudulent concealment, you have to plead it
3 with specificity under 9B.

4 I'd add too that the plaintiffs here haven't asked
5 for leave to amend. They haven't sought any amendment, and
6 we know from their PFS that Ms. Partlow had no
7 communications with 3M. She didn't go to the 3M's website.
8 There's nothing that could possibly factually constitute a
9 fraudulent concealment that could be alleged in an Amended
10 Complaint.

11 So just a word on the Minnesota Unfairness
12 Statute. The plaintiffs object to the application of
13 Alabama statute of limitations citing Minnesota's unfairness
14 statute, which, in undefined extreme circumstances would
15 allow the substitution of Minnesota's statute of
16 limitations.

17 In *Whitney v. Guys*, the Eighth Circuit case from
18 2012, the Eighth Circuit indicated that the statute should
19 rarely be employed and only except rather in extreme cases.
20 And the Court in that case, the Eighth Circuit in that case
21 found nothing unreasonable about a three-year statute of
22 limitations, and there's nothing in the logic of that
23 decision that would give a basis to conclude that a two or
24 four year statute of limitation as we have here would fall
25 into those extreme cases.

1 The plaintiffs also cite the decision in *Burks*
2 from Judge Tunheim, but in that case, Judge Tunheim
3 ultimately concluded that a one year statute of limitations
4 did not fall within the unfairness statute. So we think
5 that argument fails as well.

6 That brings us briefly to the Tennessee claims,
7 which are Counts 4 and 9. Plaintiffs in our meet and confer
8 had agreed to dismiss these claims. They then changed
9 course in their opposition and asked the Court to construe
10 these claims as claims brought under Alabama's Implied
11 Warranty Law and Alabama's Deceptive Trade Practices Act.
12 That's the way to amend a claim is by a Motion to Amend. If
13 we are construing Tennessee claims as Alabama claims, then
14 it would really eliminate Rule 15's requirements.

15 We also mentioned that, in any event, these claims
16 would still be time barred under Alabama law and also that
17 Partlow didn't satisfy the pre-suit notice requirement of an
18 Alabama Deceptive Trade Practices Act claim.

19 Finally, onto the Minnesota Consumer Protection
20 claims, the first problem here that we've highlighted is the
21 lack of public benefit. It's well-established that claims
22 under the MCFA and UTPA and MFSAA must be brought to the
23 private attorney general statute. They must be for private
24 benefit, and there is an ever growing amount of case law in
25 this district that finds that in cases like this where you

1 have individual claims brought for private damages, personal
2 injury and private damages that that doesn't satisfy the
3 public benefit exception.

4 The MFSAA, the false advertising statute,
5 according to case law in this district, doesn't apply to
6 advertising, that is heard by a non-Minnesota plaintiff or a
7 non-Minnesotan outside Minnesota. The most recent case
8 standing for that is the *McAteer* decision from July 26,
9 2018, discussed in the briefs.

10 The MDTPA claim, Count 6, is a claim for damages.
11 The MDTPA well-established only allows injunctive relief.
12 No injunctive relief sought in this case. That claim should
13 be dismissed as well.

14 And, finally, this brings us to the issue of the
15 application of Minnesota's Consumer Protection Statutes to a
16 non-Minnesota plaintiff injured outside Minnesota. This is
17 an issue that we raised in the *Axline* case. The Court noted
18 in denying it that the defendants had not cited case law on
19 this topic. We were remiss in that, and now we've cited
20 case law.

21 So here there are a series and also ever growing
22 number of cases in this district that have concluded that
23 Minnesota's Consumer Protection Statutes do not apply to
24 non-Minnesotans injured outside Minnesota. Again, the most
25 recent decision there is is the *McAteer* decision. There the

1 plaintiff was not a Minnesota resident. She bought these
2 wipes that she was suing on in California, and the Court
3 found that she lacked standing to bring a claim under
4 Minnesota's Consumer Protection Statutes, even though the
5 defendant was Target, a Minnesota company.

6 And so before that were the *Ferrari v. Best Buy*
7 case, the *Super Valu* data breach MDL, and the *Insulate SB v.*
8 *Advanced Finishing* case, all cited in our briefs, which all
9 stand for this same principle that we've articulated here.
10 Also, there is recognized in the case law including the
11 *Capitol Records* case from this district, quote, "there is a
12 general presumption that Minnesota statutes do not apply
13 extra territorially."

14 So the plaintiff cites two putative class actions
15 that sought certification of nationwide classes. These
16 cases were *Khoday* and *Kinetic*. And as we pointed out in the
17 reply brief, in *Khoday*, the defendant didn't even raise the
18 argument over whether the Minnesota statutes apply to
19 non-Minnesotans injured outside Minnesota. And in *Kinetic*,
20 the Court expressly deferred consideration of that issue to
21 the class certification stage and then there was a
22 settlement before class cert. And neither one of those
23 cases involve claims for personal injuries. So I think I've
24 got through it all, Your Honor, and I'll stop there.

25 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Assaad.

1 MR. ASSAAD: Good morning, Your Honor.

2 I'm going to be very brief, Your Honor. I will
3 address the Minnesota Consumer Protection Statutes. Defense
4 counsel is correct that many of the courts in this district
5 indicate that in federal court the Minnesota Consumer
6 Protection Statutes do not apply because of Article III
7 standing. And if the Court does dismiss this case on
8 standing, I'd ask that it dismisses it because it would be
9 considered a 12(b)(1) motion that dismisses this case
10 without prejudice because it's not on the merits.

11 THE COURT: What about the statute of limitations?

12 MR. ASSAAD: Statute of limitations. First, we do
13 dispute, as you saw in my briefing, the choice of law in
14 this case. We believe that Minnesota law applies. I went
15 through a -- I detailed the factors, and I could go through
16 them again if the Court would like me to, but the key thing
17 is unlike all of those other cases, every single act that
18 occurred in all of these cases occurred in Minnesota. And
19 not only that, currently, the actual Bair Hugger machine is
20 not sold. It is still owned by 3M and Arizant. It is their
21 machine in Alabama. They own it. Everything, every single
22 negligent act all the marketing, all the design, all the
23 packaging, everything is done in Minnesota.

24 So if you look at the predictability issue first,
25 it's predictable that if you own a product, actually own it,

1 that Minnesota law will apply. And 3M, a Minnesota company,
2 should predict that they would be brought into a Minnesota
3 court and that they be bound by the Minnesota laws for
4 product liability, and Minnesota law for statute of
5 limitations.

6 And there's a case right on point, which is the
7 *Mooney* case which I cited, in which it was an action where
8 it was a case that the Court -- sorry, that the Court
9 concluded that a Minnesota corporation under the choice of
10 law analysis said a Minnesota corporation that sells
11 products and every single act is done in Minnesota, that the
12 Minnesota choice of law would rule that the Minnesota law
13 applies.

14 THE COURT: Would the case have been timely filed
15 under Minnesota statute of limitations?

16 MR. ASSAAD: Yes, it would, Your Honor. Yes, it
17 would, and that's another issue. We'll get to the
18 fraudulent concealment, but this is not an issue that would
19 need to be decided because either through the Minnesota six
20 year statute of limitations or the fraudulent concealment,
21 the case will survive.

22 And if you look at all of the factors, the
23 maintenance of interstate and international order. It's
24 neutral simplification of the judicial task is mutual, but
25 the advancement of a forum's governmental interest, Alabama

1 has absolutely no interest in 3M's products, 3M's
2 manufacturing, design or anything. The interest here is for
3 Minnesota. Minnesota law should be applied because they
4 have the greatest interest in this case. This factor
5 definitely favors Minnesota law. Not only is 3M a Minnesota
6 company, but it also effects its economy, its citizens, 3M's
7 employees. Alabama has no interest.

8 And if you look at the *Fluck v. Jacobson Machine*
9 *Works* case, which is out of this district in 1999, this was
10 a Colorado resident that was injured by defective seed mixer
11 in Colorado, and this Court held that the Minnesota law
12 applied and the statute of repose in Colorado should not bar
13 plaintiff's private liability claims.

14 It is almost a similar issue, the statute of
15 repose and the statute of limitations. And this Court said
16 basically that the advancement of the forum governmental's
17 interest, the courts of Minnesota, and the law of Minnesota
18 should apply to a Minnesota company that not only
19 manufactures and designs but in this case actually still
20 owns the product. If this Court decides that Alabama law
21 applies and the two-year statute of limitations apply,
22 there's fraudulent concealment.

23 And I'm not going to go through all the facts.
24 However, if you look at the *Cazalas* case, I agree with
25 *Cazalas* says if there's a failure to warn, that is not

1 enough for fraudulent concealment. We have more here. This
2 is not a case of a failure to warn such as the *Cazalas* case
3 or the other case with asbestos, that we have asbestos. 3M
4 actively went out and made fraudulent representations of
5 their product:

6 Number one, they said the Bair Hugger does not
7 disrupt laminar flow. That's an issue of fact.

8 Number two, they said that the Bair Hugger doesn't
9 put enough air compared to the air that's coming out of the
10 operating room and has no effect. That's an issue of fact
11 in this case. They say that this is safe for orthopedic
12 surgeries. It's been tested for orthopedic surgeries. They
13 went out across the country on a marketing campaign, which
14 this Court has seen documents, two million documents which,
15 by the way, all came out of the state of Minnesota. No
16 documents were produced from the state of Alabama. All
17 about the war games, you know, all of the marketing they did
18 to doctors, the Dear Doctor letters, their interaction with
19 the FDA.

20 They did something more. They did not fail to
21 warn. They went out and said this is not only not
22 dangerous, but it's safe. And these allegations and these
23 were made to doctors and to hospitals. That is more in this
24 case. It's not just a failure to warn. It is they actually
25 actively went out and promoted the product and said not only

1 is it not dangerous and these things don't happen, but it's
2 actually safe and that is the more.

3 And when it comes to, yes, Ms. Partlow did not
4 have any communications with 3M, but the Alabama Supreme
5 Court has made it very clear that the case law is very clear
6 that an allegation alleging suppression of a material fact,
7 a duty to disclose may be owed to a person with whom one has
8 not had a contractual relationship or other dealings. And
9 this is the *Wyeth v. Weeks* case, 159 So.3d 649.

10 As defense counsel said, there is a statutory duty
11 for the pharmacy to have a fiduciary duty to the public or
12 to a person by statute. We have the same thing here, Your
13 Honor. 3M has a federal statutory duty to notify the FDA
14 about any new issues or any warnings or anything that might
15 be relevant to the public.

16 We know back in 2005 that an internal document
17 said that orthopedics, that the Bair Hugger is
18 contraindicated for orthopedic surgery. They never informed
19 the FDA or the public. We also know that that same document
20 said increases airborne contamination. They did not inform
21 the public. There was a statutory duty. There's a duty to
22 the doctors and to the health care community for 3M to
23 disclose this material fact. I'm not saying whether or not
24 it's true or not. That's an issue of fact for a jury to
25 decide, but it's a fact that's an issue that in light

1 looking at the facts most favorable to the plaintiff, the
2 Court has to take those facts as true. And as a result,
3 fraudulent concealment is an issue in this case and should
4 be able to toll the statute of limitations.

5 Also, Your Honor, I mean I have other issues with
6 a learned intermediary and how it applies. I'll rest on my
7 papers, and I'll also rest on my papers on the other issues
8 with respect to the public benefit and the damages.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Assaad. Any
10 response?

11 MR. HULSE: Unless Your Honor has any questions,
12 no.

13 THE COURT: I think we've got it. We'll take it
14 under advisement and issue an order in due course.

15 Ms. Zimmerman, anything else we need to discuss?
16 I understand that you'll be going down and having a party on
17 the ninth floor.

18 MS. ZIMMERMAN: I was just re-reviewing the
19 agenda. I think we've completed everything, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Seemed like it. Thanks very much.
21 Mr. Blackwell?

22 MR. BLACKWELL: Your Honor, perhaps the only other
23 outstanding thing is simply to scheduling a motion for
24 reconsideration.

25 THE COURT: Oh, right, right, thank you. Here's

1 the schedule:

2 3M, January 24th. Plaintiffs, February 21st.

3 Defendants reply March 14th.

4 MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: There's the schedule.

6 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And from
7 the plaintiffs' perspective, we've asked I guess to know if
8 the motion is intended to be based on new evidence, and we
9 don't have an answer to that question yet. But to the
10 extent that it is new evidence, we'd like to know what the
11 new evidence is so that we can address it properly, and I
12 expect that there will likely be a motion to conduct
13 discovery such that plaintiffs can respond to new evidence.

14 THE COURT: We'll see what happens. We'll see
15 what they submit.

16 All right. Thank you very much. We are in
17 recess.

18 (Court adjourned at 10:34 a.m.)

19 * * *

20 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

21 I, Maria V. Weinbeck, certify that the foregoing is
22 a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
23 above-entitled matter.

24 Certified by: s/ Maria V. Weinbeck

25 Maria V. Weinbeck, RMR-FCRR